

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-21 are pending in the application. Claims 1-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,128,279 to O'Neil et al., (hereinafter "O'Neil"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,748,448 to Barrera et al., (hereinafter "Barrera"). Claims 1-21 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Neil in view of U.S. Patent 6,954,783 to Bodwell et al., (hereinafter "Bodwell"). Applicants traverse these rejections and respectfully request reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 8 and 15 to clarify the operation of an embodiment of the present application. Such amendments are supported at least by paragraphs 015-021 of the specification. No new matter has been added.

Applicants submit that the cited references do not teach, suggest or describe "[a] method of accessing data from a plurality of servers comprising: ... *adding an identity of the first server to the data and forwarding the data to the client computer wherein subsequent requests received from the client computer include said first server identity and sending each of said subsequent requests to said first server.*" (e.g., as described in the embodiment of claim 1).

A. Rejection under §103(a) – O'Neil in view of Barrera

Applicants agree with the Examiner's assessment that O'Neil does not describe adding an identity of the first server to the data and forwarding the data to the client computer. *See* Office Action dated 5/4/2007, page 3. Furthermore, the Board did not dispute this interpretation of O'Neil in the decision on appeal dated January 31, 2011 and found that "the Barrera reference discloses identifying a specific data storage device controller using a URL." *See* Decision on Appeal at page 5.

Accordingly, Applicants assert that the combination of Barrera and O'Neil fails to disclose "adding an identity of the first server to the data and forwarding the data to the client computer wherein subsequent requests received from the client computer include said first server identity, and sending each of said subsequent requests to said first server" as recited in the claims of the present application.

Barrera discloses using a URL addressing scheme for efficiently accessing resource files on a networked server system. *See* Column 4, lines 10-25. Barrera discloses the following steps:

1. Web client logs on to the Web through an Internet Service Provider (ISP);
2. The client selects a URL corresponding to a specific static page item, defining a resource file location on a data storage device connected to the Web server host;
3. Web server host receives an HTTP request (typically on port 80) from the client;
4. Host listener demon processes the request, by invoking the CGI script or a special software routine that parses and decodes the URL request;
5. CGI script or the special software routine identifies the physical I/O address of the resource file from the URL and passes the request directly to the data storage device controller, thus avoiding the file I/O system;
6. Upon receiving the resource file, the host sends the resource file to the Web client using HTTP.

Column 8, lines 40-62.

Therefore, Applicants submit that the cited URL address of Barrera is *sent* as part of an instruction request sent to the *host server* to *initiate the locating* of the requested file. Barrera does not disclose at least including a URL address as part of a *retrieval* process to be sent to *the requesting* party but rather describes a *client browser* sending a request with a URL link. Such a request is passed on to the server 14 *as part of the request*. There is no mention of the sending of a URL address as part of a retrieval process to be sent to the requesting party in the cited section, and it definitely does not include a description of “... *adding an identity of the first server to the data* and forwarding the data *to the client computer wherein subsequent requests received from the client computer include said first server identity; and sending each of said subsequent requests to said first server*” as described in embodiments of the present application.

In order to support a proper §103(a) rejection, the cited references must include a similar teaching, suggestion or description. For at least the above reasons, Applicants maintain the Barrera reference does not.

B. Rejection under §103(a) – O’Neil in view of Bodwell

As stated above, Applicants agree with the Examiner’s assessment that O’Neil does not describe adding an identity of the first server to the data and forwarding the data to the client computer. *See* Office Action dated 5/4/2007, page 6.

Accordingly, Applicants assert that this combination of Bodwell and O’Neil fails to disclose “adding an identity of the first server to the data and forwarding the data to the client computer wherein subsequent requests received from the client computer include said first server identity; and sending each of said subsequent requests to said first server” as recited in the claims of the present application. Bodwell describes utilizing the software program 5 of intermediate server 10 to forward *user requests* for the target web server 30 through intermediate server 10. Software program 5, and therefore the intermediate server 20, thereafter redirects to client requests of the web page 35 to the target web server 30. Adding the identity of a first server that provides the data is not the same as adding the identity of an unrelated intermediate server.

In the cited example, the software program 5 embeds the name of the target server, but does not forward the requested file including the identity of a server *to a client computer* as described in embodiments of the present application (*e.g.*, claim 1). The embedding (of the target server’s name and the special identifier) described in Bodwell is directed to communication between an intermediate server and a target server to achieve the end of routing all future requests of the relevant target server through the relevant intermediate server. It fails to describe at least adding an identity of a server to data *and forwarding the data to a client computer wherein subsequent requests received from the client computer include said first server identity and sending each of said subsequent requests to said first server* altogether.

In order to support a proper rejection, the Bodwell reference must teach or suggest each and every limitation as claimed. As shown above, the Bodwell reference does not; any combination of Bodwell, O’Neil, and Barrera does not either. Applicants submit the current rejection is lacking for at least the above reasons.

Therefore, since each and every element of claim 1 is not taught, suggested or described

Application No. 10/083,557
Amendment and RCE dated: March 31, 2011
Reply to Decision on Appeal dated January 31, 2011

by the cited references, Applicants respectfully submit that the §103(a) rejections are lacking and should be withdrawn. Likewise, independent claims 8 and 15 include similar limitations. Claims 2-7, 9-14, and 16-20 depend from and further define allowable independent claims 1, 8, and 15, and therefore are allowable as well.

For at least the above reasons, it is believed that this Response places the application in condition for allowance, and early favorable consideration of this Response is earnestly solicited.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees, or credit any overpayments, to Deposit Account No. **11-0600**.

Respectfully submitted,
KENYON & KENYON LLP

Date: March 31, 2011

By: /Michelle McLeod/
Michelle McLeod
(Reg. No. 63,282)

KENYON & KENYON LLP
333 West San Carlos St., Suite 600
San Jose, CA 95110

Telephone: (408) 975-7500
Facsimile: (408) 975-7500